

Date: Thu, 14 Jan 93 04:30:25 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #13
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 14 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 13

Today's Topics:

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 12 Jan 1993 22:17:46 EST
From: uunet.ca!xenitec!lemsys!clemon@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec31.150918.17046@ke4zv.uucp>, <RuTNwB5w165w@stat.com>,
<ov1gs*w90@lemsys.UUCP>
Subject : Re: 430 mhz band under th (now repeater costs)

In article <C0n3Jy.3E0@NeoSoft.com>, Jim Reese writes:

> In article <ov1gs*w90@lemsys.UUCP> clemon@lemsys.UUCP (Craig Lemon VE3XCL)
> writes:
> > In article <RuTNwB5w165w@stat.com>, David Dodell writes:
> >
> >> How do you judge the * most effective use * ??? I think this can become
> >> subjective. Some of the "closed" machines that I use are busier then the
> >> open machines. Some of the open UHF machines in Phoenix have no user
> >> base, and sit idle for hours at a time.
> >
> > Yes... _SOME_. How about addressing _MOST_ and _the majority of_
> >
> You're making the incorrect assumption that closed systems outnumber open
> ones in all parts of the spectrum/country...this is simply not true.

No I'm not. I was merely emphasizing the *SOME* part of things. Not all repeaters are like yours either. I am I ham, after all, and operate in my area where open outnumber closed, by far.

> Yes, in California, on UHF, the closed systems do outnumber the open ones,
> and there are many which are under-utilized. What I object to, as the
> owner of an active closed system, is the automatic assumption that all
> closed systems are low activity, just put on for someone's ego, and never
> allow any new people to talk on them. This is offensive and unrealistic.
> It is also false.

I object to the behaviour you describe but I did not assume that *ALL* closed systems are like this. *ALL* was not contained anywhere in my post. Although, I believe *most* or *the majority of* may still apply. A lot of closed machines may be never used (or may not even have radios). A lot are ego trips and cheap cell-phones for their owners (we have one of these in town). There is also the fact that a closed repeater may be highly used, (by the owner and his immediate friends, who may still call the repeater "open") but it is used with GARBAGE. Yes, it *is* up to the owner of the machine what traffic passes through it. It's just a private intercom, co-ordinating a game of Aces of the Pacific or Wing Commander over the phone. I've also heard them used by a group of 5-8 people travelling from a club meeting to a coffee shop, all talking on the repeater even though they're one behind the other, all the while "Sorry, you desensed me, try that again!?". Some like to talk into remote link 50 miles away that link right back to the in-town repeater just because they can. While there is nothing illegal about this behaviour, it's kind of silly, isn't it? Once again, for added clarity, EVERYONE WITH A CLOSED MACHINE DOESN'T DO THIS but a lot do. Just in case I didn't say it loud enough the first time.

> > There's a large difference involved here. Giving out control codes
> > and allowing someone to talk are two totally different things.
>
> Why? If you trust someone to use your station (and license) anytime he wants
> to, why should you not trust the same person to punch buttons?

You have a point, but autopatch access is something with a definite added benefit to repeater users (incentive to "join the club"). Having control of repeater operations can do a lot more "damage" than letting someone talk on the air. You have a valid point, however.

I suppose it bugs me when a "closed" system is erected to be a private cell-phone, or to be used in a 14-frequency linking system to talk across the subdivision (don't laugh!), or to talk on when everyone is all on the same road, one behind the other, using 50W mobiles (complaining about desense all the way) ad infinitum... especially in areas like CA

where the band is crowded. These are the people I would call INEFFECTIVE.

--

Craig Lemon VE3XCL (Advanced) - Kitchener, Ontario. +1 519 741 0297
clemon@lemsys.UUCP clemon%lemsys@xenitec.on.ca | 1B Electrical Engineering
TCP/IP: ve3xcl@ve3xcl.ampr.org [44.135.84.51] | University of Waterloo
AX.25 Packet: ve3xcl@ve3euk.#SWON.ON.CAN.NA | Waterloo, Ontario, CANADA

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #13
